

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

In the Final Office Action mailed July 10, 2009, claims 1 – 19 were rejected. In response, Applicant proposes amending claims 1, 9, and 14. Applicant respectfully requests that the proposed amendments be entered to put the claims in condition for allowance or to put the claims in better condition for appeal. Applicant hereby requests reconsideration of the application in view of the proposed amendments and the below-provided remarks.

### Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112

Claims 1 – 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. In particular, claims 1, 8, 14, and 19 were rejected as being “confusing to understand what it means since the instant invention does not disclose this aspect.” Applicant has amended claims 1, 9, and 14 as described below. Applicant respectfully asserts that the amended claims particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

### Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 1 – 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Young et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,680,545, hereinafter Young) in view of Saran et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,143,396, hereinafter Saran). However, Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are patentable over Young in view of Saran for the reasons provided below.

#### Claim 1

Applicant proposes amending claim 1 to particularly point out that the semiconductor component has an inner connection metallization and a separate reinforcing system that has an open grid structure that leaves portions of the doped silicon substrate exposed. Additionally, Applicant proposes amending claim 1 to particularly

point out that the inner connection metallization is in direct contact with the doped silicon substrate at the exposed portions of the doped silicon substrate. Support for the amendment is found in Applicant's specification at, for example, paragraphs [0027], [0038], [0048], and [0075] – [0077] (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2008/0230920 A1). As amended claim 1 recites:

“A semiconductor component comprising a semiconductor chip made of a doped silicon substrate, which chip is doped into a semiconductor device and structured, and comprises;

an inner connection metallization in a contact window, and said inner connection metallization of said semiconductor chip is connected to a respective outer connection metallization by a wire bond connection; and

a reinforcing system formed from a different material than the inner connection metallization and that has an open grid structure on the doped silicon substrate, wherein the open grid structure leaves portions of the doped silicon substrate exposed;

wherein the inner connection metallization is in direct contact with the doped silicon substrate at the exposed portions of the doped silicon substrate.”

(emphasis added)

In the Final Office Action, Young is cited as teaching all of the limitations of claim 1 (as presented on March 19, 2009) “except said inner connection metallization of said semiconductor chip comprises a reinforcing system having an open grid structure on the doped silicon substrate with an opening, that is, a bonding pad on the semiconductor substrate comprising an grid/lattice formation with an opening.” Saran is cited as teaching the above-identified limitation.

Applicant asserts that amended claim 1 is patentable over Young in view of Saran because Young in view of Saran do not teach an open grid structure that leaves portions of the doped silicon substrate exposed or an inner connection metallization that is in direct contact with the doped silicon substrate at the exposed portions of the doped silicon substrate.

As admitted in the Final Office Action, Young does not teach a reinforcing system. Although Saran is cited for teaching a reinforcing system, the reinforcing system of Saran does not leave portions of the doped silicon substrate exposed such that the inner connection metallization is in direct contact with the doped silicon substrate at the exposed portions of the doped silicon substrate. With reference to Fig. 1 of Saran, reinforcing structure (30) does not have an open grid structure that leaves portions of a

doped silicon substrate exposed. In particular, the reinforcing structure (30) is formed by a first dielectric layer (32) that completely separates the weak dielectric layer (34) (i.e., conductive layer) from any underlying doped silicon substrate. Additionally, because the reinforcing structure does not have an open grid structure that leaves portions of a doped silicon substrate exposed, Applicant asserts that the bond pad (12) of Young is not in direct contact with a doped silicon substrate at exposed portions of the doped silicon substrate.

Because Young in view of Saran does not teach every limitation of amended claim 1, Applicant asserts that amended claim 1 is patentable over Young in view of Saran.

Independent Claims 9 and 14

Independent claims 9 and 14 have been amended to include similar limitations to amended claim 1. Although the language of claims 9 and 14 differs from the language of claim 1 and the scope of claims 9 and 14 should be interpreted independently of claim 1, Applicant respectfully asserts that the remarks provided above in regard to claim 1 apply also to claims 9 and 14.

Dependent Claims 2 – 8, 10 – 13, and 15 – 19

Claims 2 – 8 depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of claim 1, claims 10 – 13 depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of claim 9, and claims 15 – 19 depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of claim 14. Applicant respectfully asserts claims 2 – 8, 10 – 13, and 15 – 19 are allowable at least based on an allowable base claim.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims in view of the amended claim, the new claims, and the remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Generally, in this Amendment and Response, Applicant has not raised all possible grounds for (a) traversing the rejections of the Action or (b) patentably distinguishing any new claims (i.e., over the Cited References or otherwise). Applicant however, reserves the right to explicate and expand on any ground already raised and/or to raise other grounds for traversing and/or for distinguishing, including, without limitation, by explaining and/or distinguishing the subject matter of the Application and/or any cited reference at a later time (e.g., in the event that this Application does not proceed to issue with the claims as herein amended, or in the context of a continuing application).

Applicant submits that nothing herein is, or should be deemed to be, a disclaimer of any rights, acquiescence in any rejection, or a waiver of any arguments that might have been raised but were not raised herein, or otherwise in the prosecution of this Application, whether as to the original claims or as to any of the new claims, or otherwise. Without limiting the generality of the foregoing, Applicant reserves the right to reintroduce one or more of the original claims in original form or otherwise so as to claim the subject matter of those claims, both/either at a later time in prosecuting this Application or in the context of a continuing application.

At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any over payment to Deposit Account **50-4019** pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.25. Additionally, please charge any fees to Deposit Account **50-4019** under 37 C.F.R. 1.16, 1.17, 1.19, 1.20 and 1.21.

Respectfully submitted,

/mark a. wilson/

Date: September 9, 2009

Mark A. Wilson  
Reg. No. 43,994

Wilson & Ham  
PMB: 348  
2530 Berryessa Road  
San Jose, CA 95132  
Phone: (925) 249-1300  
Fax: (925) 249-0111